

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. DOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,165	01/18/2002	Katsuhiko Fukasaku	NE253-US	7604
7:	590 07/01/2003			
McGinn & Gibb, PLLC			EXAMINER	
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200 Vienna, VA 22182-3817			IM, JUNGHWA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	
			DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		arv
• •	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/050,165	FUKASAKU, KATSUHIKO
Advicery Action	Examin r	Art Unit
	Junghwa M. Im	2811
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from:	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•	
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 7-23.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:	SUPERVISORY	THOMAS PATENT EXAMINER BY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed limitation of LDD regions using side walls and a gate electrode as a mask is an example of new issue which would require further research and consideration to determine patentability.